

BUDDHIST QUEST FOR DEEP ECOLOGY*

Professor K.T.S. Sarao *PhD (Delhi); PhD (Cantab).***

Ecology is the study of relationships among organisms themselves as well as between organisms and their environment. Human approach to ecology may be divided into two categories: deep and shallow. In the *shallow* view of ecology, all the living beings in their natural diversity are perceived as resources, useful for humans but not in and of themselves. This view as the name suggests smacks of selfishness on the part of humankind. Such a view believes that sustaining our way of life and our individual habits of mind are basic elements of a democratic society that should be tolerated and sustained, even if it entails our being cruel, our polluting the biosphere, our driving to extinction other life forms, and our declining quality of life (Tobias, 1998: 128). Arne Naess of Norway was the first person who suggested the notion of *deep ecology* in 1973 with the purposes of hoping to build a methodology through which human beings might develop an unselfish self leading to complete identification with the biosphere. *Deep ecology*, which is also sometimes called *deep ethology*, believes that faulting cruelty, respecting other life forms for their intrinsic worth irrespective of their potential usefulness to humans, and arguing that through such respect and nurturance, our own lives will be greatly enriched, made more meaningful, and assured of a better chance at survival (Tobias, 1998: 128). Such a thinking expects that people recognize not only that they are an important part of nature, but also that they have unique responsibilities to nature as moral agents. Deep ethological research is expected to pursue a detailed and compassionate understanding of the unique worlds of nonhuman animals themselves in order to learn more about their own points of view: how they live and how they experience pain and suffering. The development of what are called species-fair tests that take into account the different sensory worlds and abilities of animals will allow humans to learn more about how all animals deal with their social and non-social environments, including pleasurable and painful or stressful stimuli.

In the wake of the alarming degradation of the environment and destruction of large number of species of animals it has become imperative for humankind to reevaluate its attitude towards environment and animals. A civilization in which we must kill and exploit other forms of life in order to live is not a civilization of mentally healthy people. Social sciences are blatantly anthropocentric and it is taken as a matter of fact to pay little or no attention to the nonhuman domain of animalkind. It is quite depressing when one thinks of the atrocities perpetrated by humans against ecology and the tremendous loss of natural beauty and diversity. The destruction and debasement of the ecology has been constantly occurring through cruel methods of hunting, fishing, butchering, deforesting, over-mining, excessive use of pesticides, and pollution in various forms. The modern problems of environmental destruction in the third world are to a very great extent a creation of the influence of Western civilization and its attitudes and values. The military and economic success of Western goods- aspects which appeal to deep-rooted human instincts like search for material safety and greed for wealth and comfort: instincts which have always tended to overcome religious inhibitions. Curiously, there is on the one hand, the necessity for humans to live on nature (i.e., on animals, plants and the elements), and on the other, the fact that

*This essay is the enlarged and modified version of the papers read at the the *Indo-Korean International Seminar on Buddhist Culture* organized at New Delhi by the Indian Council of Philosophical Research and Department of Buddhist Studies, Donguk University, Seoul (S. Korea), 5-7 December, 2001 at New Delhi.

**Professor K.T.S. Sarao is currently the Head, Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi.

exploitation destroys precisely this basis of man's life. We have got into the present mess is due to the unbridled development guided by a profit-oriented economic system. The Conference on Climate Change held at Kyoto in 1997 is a quintessential example of such an attitude. Virtually every participating nation in this conference insisted on the right to pursue the path of unrestricted economic growth. This means that in the future the pollution of our air and water will become unbearable and which, in turn, shall rip away the very support systems that make life on earth possible. Though the solution does not lie in the rejection of science and technology, but their proper place in the scale of human values must be identified. Their function is to help in mitigating poverty and deprivation, and to help provide the material prosperity needed as a basis for the pursuit of other goals -cultural, intellectual, and spiritual.

The human economy does not operate in an infinite expanse capable of providing an inexhaustible supply of resources. When the economy expands, it does so by absorbing into itself more and more of the resource base of the extremely fragile and finite ecosystem and by burdening the ecosystem in turn with its waste. But long before the human economy reaches that limit, it will cross a threshold point beyond which the delicate fabric of the ecosystem will be damaged so badly that it shall no longer be capable of sustaining higher forms of life. We may already be very close to that threshold and as human population increases further, the stress on the environment is bound to rise to even more perilous levels. Our economy is already big enough and our technologies too smart and too powerful. What we need most of all is streamlining and downsizing: cutting down on weapons production, on industries dedicated to wasteful luxuries, on conspicuous consumption as the engine that drives the economy. Unfortunately, these days we are so wedded to the notion that happiness depends upon a vigorous application of the verb 'to possess' that those who do not become part of such a rat race are seen as 'dismal,' and 'loathsome.' Instead we need qualitative improvements to make our technologies more humble and humane, more benign towards the total biosphere. And above all, we need greater stress on economic justice and social equity, so that no one need be deprived of a fair standard of living. Our current social order promotes competition rather than cooperation. This is bound to generate conflict and resentment. A society founded upon the Dhamma recognizes that one should aim to promote the goal of the greater unit to which one belongs, and as a minimum should never seek private fulfilment in ways that inflict harm on others. The ideal is nicely pointed out in the "six principles of harmony and respect" which the Buddha taught to the Samgha: loving kindness in thinking, speech, and deeds; sharing gains made righteously; and following a common code of ethics and morality. Thus, in a Buddhist approach to social and economic development, the primary criterion that would govern policy formulation should be the well-being of the members of the society as a whole. The economy would be assigned to the place where it belongs and, in turn, the social system would be viewed as an integral part of the total ecosystem. Thus, economic development would be guided along lines that promote the health and well-being of the social order without harming the natural systems within which human society is lodged. By pointing out that the vulgar chase of luxury and abundance is the root-cause of suffering, Buddhism encourages restraint, simplicity, and contentment. By extolling generosity as a basic virtue and the mark of a superior person, it promotes a wide distribution of basic necessities so that no one has to suffer deprivation.

As we live in a pluralistic world, it may not be possible for any single spiritual tradition to handle the task of 'healing the wounds of the world'. What is needed is a cooperative effort by all men and women of spiritual sensitivity regardless of their faith. In this paper, we hope to bring out those aspects of the Buddhist approach of moderation based on the Middle Path that can provide a healing touch in times of severe ecological degradation. For Buddhism material satisfaction merely provides a starting point for the pursuit of higher goals. Since human beings are social creatures who naturally come together for common ends, this means that a social order guided by Buddhist principles would consist primarily of small-scale communities in which each member can make an effective contribution. Only small-scale

social arrangements can rescue people from the portending future disaster. Considered from a Buddhist point of view, the huge polluted mega-cities and uncaring bureaucrats and politicians typical of our age are unsuitable for a proper welfare of sentient beings. The most suitable and compatible economy would be small-scale and localized. Such an economy would use simple technology which would not drain natural resources and in its production would be aimed principally at local consumption, so that there would be direct face-to-face contact between producers and consumers. The driving force of such an economy would be the promotion of well-being both material and social, not commercial profit and unrestrained expansion.

Buddhism has always been steeped in the sacredness of nature and scholars like Lynn White Jr (1967) have claimed that Buddhism is more explicitly positive in its concern for the natural world unlike the Judaic-Christian faiths which place humans and their artifices over and against the ‘natural’ world of animals, plants and the physical environment. Some European Buddhologists like Venturini influenced by Far Eastern Buddhism strongly emphasize the necessity of “harmony with nature,” but do so in the context of an “ecology of the mind” which aims at a “purified” world with man (1990: 19-23). Various forms of Chinese and Japanese Buddhism, perceive each of the animals and plants as capable of becoming a Buddha. The Buddhist texts speak of harmlessness to the plant and vegetable kingdom (*bija gāma bhūta gāma*). As a matter of fact, the Buddhist custom of Rainy Retreat (*vassāvāsa*) owes its origins to such a concern. Incurring such damage is an offence which requires expiation on the part of the monk. This may be interpreted as an extension of the principle of non-injury (*ahimsā*) to the vegetable kingdom. A consequence of this insistence is that animals and plants are to be respected and such respect arises naturally from the insight, provided by Buddhist cosmology, that all sentient beings are intimately interrelated. One can find a good example of this in the Thai monks who, amongst themselves and with lay-people, work to protect remaining areas of virgin forest and to re-forest other areas whose previous felling had led to disruption of water supply or flooding (Harvey 2000: 181-2; Batchelor & Brown 1992: 92-9).

Buddhism neither sees humans as a special creation by ‘God’, nor does it see them as having been given either ‘dominion’ or ‘stewardship’ over the animal kingdom. Though humans have a greater freedom and capacity for understanding than animals, like all the other sentient beings, humans also wander in the limited, conditioned realm of *samsāra*, the round of rebirths. The greater forte and intellect of humans, however, does not imply exploitation, but an attitude of kindness to lesser beings, an ideal of *oblesse oblige* (Hall 1902: 229-47). This is backed up by the reflection that one’s present fortunate position as a human is only a temporary state of affairs conditioned by past good karma. One cannot detach oneself from the plight of animals, as one has oneself gone through it (S.II.186), just as animals have had past rebirths as humans. Moreover, in the cycle of births, every being one comes across, down to an insect, will at some time have been a close friend or relative, and had been very good to one (S.II.189-90). Keeping this in mind, one should return the kindness in the present.

In the present times, bureaucrats and politicians at the behest of industrialists, through powerful strategies often hidden by camouflage and deceit, nurture and support the distorted views and unhealthy attitudes, wreaking havoc all around. Such an attitude has led to many environmental problems, and thus to reflection on how humans should act and live so as to be in a less destructive and self-undermining relationship with ‘nature.’ As the Vietnamese monk Thich Nhat Hanh says, “We classify other animals and living beings as nature, acting as if we ourselves are not part of it. Then we pose the question ‘How should we deal with nature?’ We should deal with nature the way we should deal with ourselves! We should not harm ourselves; we should not harm nature... Human beings and nature are inseparable.” (Eppsteiner, 1988: 41). As part of Conditioned Arising (*paṭiccasamuppāda*), humans are

seen as having an effect on their environment not only through the purely physical aspects of their actions, but also through the moral/ immoral qualities of these. That is, karmic effects sometimes catch up with people via their environment. It is thus said that, if a king and his people act unrighteously, this has a bad effect on the environment and its gods, leading to little rain, poor crops and weak, short-lived people (A.II.74-76). Right actions have the opposite effect. The environment is held by Buddhism to respond to the state of human morality; it is not a neutral stage on which humans merely flounce or a sterile container unaffected by human actions. This clearly has ecological ramifications: humans cannot ignore the effect of their actions on their environment. This message is also strongly implied by the *Aggañña Sutta* (D.III.84-93), which gives an account of the initial stages of the development of sentient life on earth. This occurs when previously divine beings fall from their prior state, and through consuming a savoury crust floating on the oceans, develop physical bodies, and later sexual differentiation. At first their environment is bountiful, but it becomes less so the more they greedily take from it. They feed off sweet-tasting fungus, and then creepers, but these in turn disappear as the beings differentiate in appearance the more beautiful ones become conceited and arrogant. Then they feed off quick-growing rice, gathering it each day as they need it. But through laziness, they start to gather a week's supply at a time, so that it then ceases to grow quickly, which necessitates cultivation. Consequently, the land is divided up into fields, so that property is invented, followed by theft. Here, then, is a vision of sentient beings and their environment co-evolving (co-devolving). The beings are affected by what they take from their environment, and the environment becomes less refined and fruitful as the beings morally decline. All this takes place according to the principle of Conditioned Arising in which nothing exists on its own, as each thing depends on others to condition its arising and existence. Thus, the relationship of all things, which includes humans and their environment, is inter-dependent. In other words, nothing can exist by itself, but makes its own contribution to the whole. Thus, as pointed out in the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* says, "Every living being and every minute thing is significant, since even the tiniest thing contains the whole mystery."

In Ch'an/ Zen school the traditional ideal has been one of harmony with nature, particularly emphasized through such actions as blending meditation huts into the landscape, not wasting any food in monasteries, landscape painting, landscape gardening, and nature poetry (Suzuki 1959: ch. 11). In paintings, human beings are just one part of a natural scene, not the focus. Great attention is paid to seemingly insignificant aspects of nature, for insight into them can give an intuitive appreciation of the inexpressible and cryptic 'suchness' which runs through the whole fabric of existence. Such a harmony with natural phenomenon is also visible in the different poems of the *Theragāthā*. They admire the delightful rocks, 'cool with water, having pure streams, covered with Indagopaka insects' (verse 1063), resonant with elephants and peacocks, 'covered with flax flowers as the sky is covered with clouds' (verse 1068), 'with clear water and wide crags, haunted by monkeys and deer, covered with oozing moss, those rocks delight me' (verse 1070), 'forests are delightful' (verse 992). The Buddha is also said to have had a positive effect on his environment. Accounts of the Buddha's life are richly embellished with allusions to nature. He was born under a tree and as he took his first steps, lotus flowers sprang up. During childhood he often meditated under a jambo tree. His gave his first sermon in an animal park and his Enlightenment took place under a bo tree. When he lay down between two *sāl* trees to die and pass into Nibbāna, these are said to have burst into a mass of unseasoned blossom, which fell on him in homage (D.II.137-38). It goes without saying that the Buddhist ideal for humanity's relationship with animals, plants and the landscape is one of complimentary and harmonious co-operation.

Forest represents the ideal place for meditation for monks (M.I.118). The ideal of forest-dwelling has an important place in Buddhist thinking and the forest was employed as a meditational device. A number of prominent Buddhist writers recommend mindfulness of the forest as a means of gaining insight into impermanence. In fact, Theravāda monks specializing in meditation are known as

‘forest monks,’ whether or not they actually reside in the forest (Carrithers 1983; Tambiah 1984). The forest-dwelling monk, the hermit (See, Kabil Singh 1990: 304), is no longer afraid (Vin.II.184) of the wild animals because he on his part does not threaten them but offers them safety and friendship (Cp.43); is happy in the solitude of the wilderness (E.g., Vin.II.183f; M.I.23; S.II.202f) because he has abandoned worldly desires and is content with little (Vin.II.184; D.I.71; S.II.202; A.III.219). Buddhism appreciates the spiritual benefits of wilderness. The solitude and silence of the wilderness is perceived as most favourable to meditation (Sn.221; Schmithausen 1985: 109; L. de Silva 1987: 21). On the whole, Buddhist attitude towards wild nature is quite positive and on account of this positive evaluation it ought to be preserved as well as restored in case it has been destroyed for some reason (M.I.117). From this point of view, the “hermit attitude” towards nature deserves, nowadays, to become, as a supplement to the traditional Buddhist ethics of not killing any living being and of compassion and benevolence, the attitude of all Buddhists. Indeed, it appears that this attitude is, in fact, an important element in the rise of ecological movements in some Buddhist countries (Kabil Singh 1990: 303ff). In the case of a renouncer and ascetic living in the wilderness (*aranya*) one may say that it is primarily the wild animals (and plants) that constitute his society, so to speak (Schmithausen 1991: 39). For lay people, forests may not be so inviting, but there is karmic fruitfulness in planting groves and fruit-trees for human use (S.I.33). The famous Indian Buddhist king, Asoka, is known to have prohibited the burning of forests without reason (Nikam & McKeon 1959: 56).

The Buddhist values mean that environment should not be over-exploited. As the Tibetans say very wisely that not too much of anything that is precious should be taken from the earth, as then its quality fades and the earth is destroyed (Morgan & Lawton 1996: 93). The Buddhist ideal, in fact, is co-operation with nature, not domination. The interdependence of human and all other forms of life in a finely balanced chain of being has always been a fundamental Buddhist belief. True development will arrange for the rhythm of life and movement to be in accordance with the facts, while maintaining an awareness that man is but part of the universe, and that ways must be found to integrate mankind with the laws of nature. The economist E.F. Schumacher points out that Buddhism is not so anthropocentric as the so-called Middle Eastern religions, and that its attitudes do not therefore allow for the possibility that mankind has the right to take from nature, to see nature as simply for humanity; particular use, or to exploit, dominate and oppress it. As he puts it, “Man is a child of nature and not the master of nature.” (1973: 84). He describes Buddhist attitude with reference to ecology as follows:

“The teaching of the Buddha... enjoins a reverent and non-violent attitude not only to all sentient beings but also, with great emphasis, to trees. Every follower of the Buddha ought to plant a tree every few years and look after it until it is safely established. He does not seem to realize that he is part of an ecosystem of many different forms of life. As the world is ruled from towns where men are cut off from any form of life other than the human, the feeling of belonging to an ecosystem is not realised. This results in a harsh and improvident treatment of things upon which we ultimately depend, such as water and trees.” (Schumacher 1973: 49)

Thus, as pointed out by Schumacher in the Buddhist concept of economic development, we should avoid gigantism, especially of machines, which tend to control rather than serve human beings. With gigantism, we are driven by an excessive greed in violating and raping nature. If bigness and greed can be avoided, the Middle Path of Buddhist development can be achieved, i.e., both the world of industry and agriculture can be converted into a meaningful habitat.

The earliest monastic rules as enshrined in the *Vinaya Pitaka* contain numerous

injunctions against environmental irresponsibility. Some are basically sound advice governing personal and communal hygiene, but others are designed to avoid harm to sentient beings. Thus a monk may not cut down a tree or dig the earth because that would destroy small life forms and he must not empty a vessel of water containing, say, fish, onto the ground. In Buddhism, killing or injuring living beings is regarded as both unwholesome and fundamentally immoral; for, on the one hand, killing or injuring them is bad karma entailing evil consequences for the perpetrator after his death, and on the other all living, sentient beings are afraid of death and recoil from pain just like oneself (A.III.204f, 212f; V.264f; M.I.285, 313, 489). Monks and nuns are even prohibited from injuring plants and seeds (Vin.IV.34; D.I.64). Time and again, Buddhism declares spiritual attitudes like benevolence as well as actual abstention from killing or injuring animate beings to be the right attitude or behaviour for monks as well as lay people (Sn.146; 394, 704). Buddhism also accepted the popular belief that trees are inhabited by sprites or divinities protecting them. Trees deserve gratitude for the service they render people, especially offering shade and fruits, and should not be injured or felled by a person who has benefitted by them (e.g. J.IV.352; A.III.369; cf. Kabil Singh 1987: 10; 1990: 303). This idea may not imply that the tree is actually regarded as a sentient being, but at least it is treated as if it were one, i.e., like a friend or partner. Of course, protecting a useful tree from injury is, at least *de facto*, also in the interest of its long-term utilization. (Dwivedi 1989: 197ff).

Buddhism sees egoism and greed as the main cause of misery and harm. There is no doubt that environmental disaster is to a great extent due to the insatiable greed of humans. Buddhism on the whole, though does not mind wealth and prosperity, but they have to be acquired and used in full accord with the ethical norms, among which not to kill or injure living beings, and- so one may add- not to destroy their habitat, is the first. The ideals are rather, contentment (*samtuṭṭhi*) and- in the case of rich lay people- liberality (*cāga*). Being content with little and avoiding wastefulness are, of course, attitudes favouring a moderate and careful utilization of nature. The *udumbara-khādikā* method blamed by the Buddha (A.IV.283), the method of shaking down an indiscriminate amount of fruit from a *ficus glomerata* in order to eat a few, is precisely the same as the one employed in drift-net fishing, where many more animals are killed than utilized. The only reasonable attitude is to regard all fellow-creatures with compassion and sympathy, and cautiously help them in case of emergency, without damaging others. This is in fact a fundamental attitude in Buddhist culture, and as long as the environment is intact, leaving nature alone is probably the best thing one can do. For instance, by gifts to animals (M.II.255), even such as throwing dish-water or remnants of food into a pool or river in order to feed tiny water animals or fishes (A.I.161; J.II.423), or by freeing, out of compassion, an animal from a rope or trap (Vin.III.62f; McDermott 1989: 275f).

The ecological interdependence between animals and their habitat is clearly perceived in the *Jātakas* where the emigration of tigers from a forest enables the forest beings felled by wood-cutters, but also deprives the tigers of their former habitat (J.II.356ff; Kabil Singh 1990: 303). Buddhist attitudes *ahimsā* (non-violence), *mettā* (benevolence), and *karuṇā* (compassion) entail an ecological behaviour as these attitudes are not limited to human beings alone but also include other living beings. Since the rise of technology and science, nature has been commoditized and manipulated. Our comforts have been gained at great expense to all life forms: countless peoples have been displaced by its advances; countless species become extinct each year; the earth itself is burning and groaning. To use up non-renewable goods, a possibility in the near future unless something definite is done can be the ultimate form of violence. Thus, utter caution must be exercised in the consumption process.

The Buddhist notion of the non-substantiality of an independent self or essence is seen as key to the adoption of a truly ecological perspective, as noted by Padmasiri de Silva:

The day to day maintenance of our life support system is dependent on the functional interactions of countless interdependent biotic and physiochemical factors. Since the inherent value of life is a core value in Buddhist ethical codes, the notion of reciprocity and interdependence fits in with the Buddhist notion of a causal system. A living entity cannot isolate itself from this causal nexus, and has no essence of its own. Reciprocity also conveys the idea of mutual obligation between, nature and humanity, and between people (1990: 18).

REFERENCES

Attfield, R. 1983 "Western traditions and environmental ethics," R. Eliot & A. Gane (eds), *Environmental Philosophy*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Badiner, A. H. (ed) 1990 *Dharma Gaia: A harvest of Essays in Buddhism and Ecology*, Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Batchler, M. & K. Brown (eds) 1992 *Buddhism and Ecology*, London: Cassell.

Bekoff, M. 1998 "Deep Ethology," M. Bekoff & C.A. Meaney (ed), *Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare*, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998: 129.

Bekoff, M. 1998a "Deep Ecology," M. Tobias and K. Solisti (eds), *Kinship with the Animals*, Portland, OR: Beyond Words.

Bowker, J.W. 1990 "Cosmology, Religion and Society," *Zygon*, 25: 7-23.

Callicott, J.B. & R.T. Ames (eds) 1989 *Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*, Albany: SUNY Press.

Carrithers, M. 1983 *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka: An Anthropological and Historical Study*, Delhi: OUP.

Chapple, C.K. 1993 *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*, Albany: SUNY Press.

de Silva, L. 1987 "The Buddhist Attitude towards Nature," K. Sandell (ed), *Buddhist Perspective on the Ecocrisis*, The Wheel Publication # 346/348, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1987: 9-29.

de Silva, P. 1990 "Buddhist Environmental Ethics," A.H. Badiner (ed), *Dharma Gaia: A Harvest of Essays in Buddhism and Ecology*, Berkeley: Parallax: 1990.

Dwivedi, O.P. (ed) 1989 *World Religions and the Environment*, New Delhi.

Eppsteiner, F. (ed) 1988 *The Path of Compassion: Writings on Socially Engaged Buddhism*, 2nd

edition, Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Fromm, Erich 1976 *To Have or To Be?* New York.

Gosling, D.L. 2001 *Religion and Ecology in India and Southeast Asia*, London: Routledge.

Hall, F. 1902 *The Soul of a People*, London: Macmillan.

Hardgrove, E.C. 1989 *Foundations of Environmental Ethics*, Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Harris, I. 1991 "How environmentalist is Buddhism?," *Religion*, 21, 1991: 101-14.

Harris, I. 1995 "Buddhist environmental ethics and detraditionalization: the case of EcoBuddhism," *Religion*, 25, 1995: 199-211.

Harris, I. 1995a "Getting to grips with Buddhist environmentalism: a provisional typology," *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 2, 1995: 173-90.

Harris, I. 2001 "Attitudes to nature," P. Harvey (ed), *Buddhism*, London and New York: 235-256.

Harvey, P. 2000 *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, values, and issues*, Cambridge: CUP: 150-86.

Jones, K. 1989 *The Social Face of Buddhism: An Approach to Social and Political Action*, Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Jones, K. 1994 *Beyond Optimism: A Buddhist Political Ecology*, Jon Carpenter.

Kabilsingh, C. 1987 "How Buddhism Can Help Protect Nature," S. Davies (ed), *Tree of Life: Buddhism and Protection of Nature*, Geneva: Buddhist Perception of Nature, 1987: 7-16.

Kabilsingh, C. 1990 "Buddhist Monks and Forest Conservation," *Radical Conservatism*: 301-310.

Keown, D. 1992 *The Nature of Buddhist Ethics*, London: Macmillan.

Keown, D. 1995 *Buddhism and Bioethics*, London: Macmillan.

Keown, D. (ed) 1997 *Buddhism and Contemporary Issues*, Oxford: OUP.

Kotler, A. 1996 *Engaged Buddhist Reader*, Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Ling, T. 1989 "Humanity's Relation of Nature: The Middle way," S.J. Samartha and Lynn de Silva (eds), *Man in Nature: Guest and Engineer*, Colombo: 70-75.

McDermott, J.P. 1979 "Animals and Humans in Early Buddhism," *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 32.

Morgan, P. & C. Lawton (ed) 1996 *Ethical issues in Six Religious Traditions*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Naess, A. 1973 "The Shallow and the Deep, Long Range Ecology Movement," *Inquiry*, 16, 1973: 95-100.

Naess, A. 1984 "Identification as a Source of Deep Ecological Attitude," Michael Tobias (ed), *Deep Ecology*, San Diego, CA: Avant Books, 1984: 256-270.

Nhat Hanh, Thich 1988 *The Heart of Undertsanding: Commentaries on the Prajñapāramitā Heart Sūtra*, Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Nikam, N.A. & R. McKeon 1959 *The Edicts of Asoka*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rolston, H. 1988 *Environmental Ethics: Duties to and Values in the Natural World*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sandell, K. 1987 *Buddhist Perspective on the Ecocrisis*, The Wheel Publication # 346/348, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

Schmithausen, L. 1991 *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Schmithausen, L. 1991a *Buddhism and Nature: The Lecture Delivered on the Occasion of the EXPO 1990: An Enlarged Version with Notes*, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1991.

Schmithausen, L. 1997 "The early Buddhist Tradition and ecological ethics," *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 4, 1997: 1-74.

Schumacher, E.F. 1973 *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if people Mattered*, New York: harper & Row.

Sivaraksa, S. 1988 *A Socially Engaged Buddhism*, Interreligious Commission for Development.

Suzuki, D.T. 1959 *Zen and Japanese Culture*, New York: Bollingen Foundation.

Tambiah, S.J. 1984 *The Buddhist Saints of the Forest and the Cult of Amulets*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tripathi, S.S. 1989 "Buddhism and the Ecological Crisis," O.P. Dwivedi (ed), *World Religions and the Environment*, New Delhi: 197ff.

Tobias, M 1998 "Deep Ecology," M. Bekoff & C.A. Meaney (ed), *Encyclopedia of*

Animal Rights and Animal Welfare, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998: 128-29.

Tucker, ME & DR Williams (eds) 1997 *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnection of Dharma and Deeds*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions.

Venturini, R. 1990 "A Buddhist View on Ecological Balance," *Dharma World*, 17, March-April, 1990: 19-23.

White, L. Jr 1967 "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," *Science*, 150: 1204ff.